Table 2-H-13 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Fresno to Tulare Stations

Station = Station Carried Forward

Staion = Station Eliminated

= Primary or Secondary Reason for Elimination

Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.				
Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment				
	4	4	4	3
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.				
Intermodal Connections	 Downtown location. Freeway access: Good access to SR 99 at several exits. Street access: downtown street grid Parking: may be limited at site Transit: good connections Amtrak connection with rail consolidation 	 Almost downtown location. Freeway access: Good via SR 99 and SR 180 Street access: Limited local streets Parking adequate at site. Transit: bus only Other rail: none 	 Downtown location. Freeway access: ca. 1 mile to SR 99 Street access: downtown street grid Parking: very limited Transit: buses only Other rail: Current Amtrak station, to be decommissioned after rail consolidation 	 Suburban location. Freeway access: SR 180 2 miles, SR 168 about 3 miles Street access: Arterial streets Parking adequate at shared airport facilities. Transit: Airport transit only Other rail: none
	5	3	1	2
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.	•		T	
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Operational Issues	 Freight rail consolidation may preempt use of some of corridor, limiting space for 4- track HSR station Transfer and interface with Amtrak. Normal interaction with freight RRs. 	 No major issues. Would be stopping track off new W99 alignment. 	 Numerous local crossings and slow-speed curves on BNSF line. 	No right-of-way feasible to site.
	3	5	2	1
Construction Issues	Possible narrow corridor for station with most expansive freight RR consolidation.	Normal aviation coordination required.	Constrained urban site.	Aviation coordination required.
	2	4	1	4
Capital Cost	Relatively high.	Relatively low.	Relatively high because of urban site.	Not assessed. Relatively low.
	2	4	2	4
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Availability of r-o-w interdependent with agreement with freight RRs on consolidation. Some city help with acquisition possible.	Assembly of entire new r-o-w required.	Constrained BNSF main line, to be taken out of service as result of rail consolidation.	No rail access possible.
	3	3	2	1
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.			
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts				
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	22.78	48.44	45.30	71.01
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Commercial (158); Industrial (149); Mixed Use (53); Residential (47)	Industrial (44); Residential (184); Transportation (174)	Commercial (102); Industrial (94); Institutional (84); Residential (118)	Industrial (73); Mixed Use (48); Open Space (86); Residential (245)
	3	2	2	1



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Visual Quality Impacts				
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	22.78	48.44	45.30	71.01
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0	0	0
	3	2	2	1
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.				
Water Resources Impacts				
Number of Natural Stream	0	0	0	0
Number of Wetland Crossings	1	1	1	3
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	1.22	7.13	2.08	2.95
	4	2	3	3
Floodplain Impacts				
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	1	0	1	1
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	265.83	0	235.82	8.02
	1	5	1	4
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts				
Count of Species	0	0	0	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0	0	0
	5	5	5	5
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	Resources.			
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)				
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	7358	6368	8893	1139
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	351	0	474	0
	1	2	1	3



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Farmland Impacts				
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	0	8.40	0	0
	5	4	5	5
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.		l	l	
Cultural Resources Impacts				
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	5	0	11	0
	3	5	1	5
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts				
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	1	4	2	1
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0.38	5.77	4.34	4.40
	5	1	2	2
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	ic and Soils Constraints.			
Soils/Slope Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Seismic Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport	
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potential Hazardous Materials.				
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					

12345

Least Favorable Most Favorable



Table 2-H-13 continued Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Fresno Stations

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

= Primary or Secondary Reason for Elimination

Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.		
Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment		
	2	3
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.	•	
Intermodal Connections	Exurban site. Freeway access: Close to conceptual SR 65 freeway in future. Arterial access via SR 168. No transit access.	Suburban site. Freeway access: distant from SR 99. Arterial access via SR 180 No transit access.
	2	2
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.		
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Operational Issues	New greenfields site. No major issues, except landside distance from urban area.	New greenfields site.
	4	4
Construction Issues	New greenfields site. No major issues.	New greenfields site.

Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
	5	5
Capital Cost	Low	Relatively low.
	5	4
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Open agricultural land on new alignment of freeway.	Open agricultural land on new alignment.
	5	4
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.	
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts		
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	0	0
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Farmlands/Agriculture (503.02)	Farmlands/Agriculture (503.02)
	5	5
Visual Quality Impacts		
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	0	0
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0
	5	5
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.		
Water Resources Impacts		
Number of Natural Stream	1	0
Number of Wetland Crossings	4	1
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	11.76 1	0.41 5



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
Floodplain Impacts		
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	2	0
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	123.45	0
	2	5
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts		
Count of Species	0	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0
	5	5
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	Resources.	
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)		
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	0	0
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0	0
	5	5
Farmland Impacts		
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	153.17	485.1
	2	1
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.		
Cultural Resources Impacts		
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	0
	5	5



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts		
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	0	0
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0	0
	5	5
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	ic and Soils Constraints.	
Soils/Slope Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		
Seismic Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	ial Hazardous Materials.	
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		

12345

Least Favorable

Most Favorable

